

Independence on the Abelian Projection of Monopole Condensation in QCD

A. Di Giacomo

*Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Universita',
Via Buonarroti 2 56127 Pisa, Italy ,
and INFN Sezione di Pisa**

It is proven that dual superconductivity of QCD vacuum in the confining phase is an intrinsic property, independent on the choice of the abelian projection used to define the monopoles.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Aw, 14.80.Hv

Dual superconductivity of the vacuum was proposed in the early times of QCD as a mechanism for color confinement[1, 2]. Here dual means interchange of electric and magnetic with respect to ordinary superconductivity. The basic idea is that, in the confining phase, magnetic charges condense in the vacuum, and the chromoelectric field acting between two colored particles is channeled into Abrikosov flux tubes by dual Meissner effect, giving an energy proportional to the distance, $V(r) = \sigma r$, or confinement. Above the deconfining transition this phenomenon should disappear.

When trying to make this idea more precise, however, it looks less unique than expected. A procedure known as Abelian Projection[3] is needed to define monopoles, which implies the choice of an operator $\Phi(x) = T^a \Phi^a(x)$, transforming in the adjoint representation of the gauge group, say $SU(N)$. After diagonalization of $\Phi(x)$ in color space by a gauge transformation (Abelian Projection), $N - 1$ $U(1)$ residual gauge symmetries exist, whose magnetic charges are conserved. Dual superconductivity means Higgs breaking of these magnetic $U(1)$ symmetries. A priori monopoles defined by different abelian projections, i.e. by different choices of the operator Φ , are not related to each other. Indeed their number and locations are different when observed in any given field configuration. The question is then what monopoles do condense in the vacuum to produce dual superconductivity. One possibility is that some abelian projection is privileged (see ref[4] for a review). Another extreme possibility is that all abelian projections are physically equivalent, as guessed in ref[3].

The mechanism of confinement by dual superconductivity has been investigated on the lattice[5, 6, 7], by studying the expectation value of an operator $\mu(x)$, which creates a monopole in some abelian projection. The expectation is that in the confined phase (Higgs phase) its vev $\langle \mu \rangle$ is non-zero signalling monopole condensation; in the deconfining phase $\langle \mu \rangle = 0$, the Hilbert space being superselected with respect to magnetic charge. Around T_c , $\langle \mu \rangle_{T \rightarrow T_c} = (1 - T/T_c)^\delta$. $\langle \mu \rangle$ is called a disorder parameter in the language of statistical mechanics, being the order parameter of the strong coupling (disordered) confining phase. What is found by numerical simulations is that indeed $\langle \mu \rangle \neq 0$ at $T < T_c$, $\langle \mu \rangle = 0$ at $T > T_c$, $\delta = .20(3)$ for $SU(2)$, $\delta = .50(3)$ for $SU(3)$, and that $\langle \mu \rangle$ is independent of the choice of the abelian projection[5, 6, 7] within errors.

In this letter we show that the independence of $\langle \mu \rangle$ on the abelian projection follows from gauge invariance, and that it also holds for any correlator $\langle T[\mu(x_1) \dots \mu(x_n)] \rangle$ of creation operators of monopoles. It follows that dual superconductivity of the confining phase is an intrinsic property, independent of the choice of the abelian projection, and so is the coulomb nature of the deconfined phase.

The key quantity to define the abelian projection corresponding to an operator $\Phi(x)$ in the adjoint representation is 'tHooft's field strength tensor[8]

$$F_{\mu\nu} = Tr \{ \Phi G_{\mu\nu} \} - \frac{i}{g} Tr \{ \Phi [D_\mu \Phi, D_\nu \Phi] \} \quad (1)$$

$F_{\mu\nu}$ is gauge invariant and color singlet. The notation is standard

$$\Phi = \Phi^a T^a, \quad A_\mu = A_\mu^a T^a, \quad G_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + ig [A_\mu, A_\nu], \quad D_\mu \Phi = \partial_\mu \Phi - ig [A_\mu, \Phi]$$

T^a are the group generators, with $Tr\{T^a T^b\} = \delta^{ab}$. For particular choices of Φ the tensor in eq(1) becomes an abelian field strength in the gauge in which Φ is diagonal.

For $SU(2)$ gauge group this happens for any operator $\hat{\Phi} = \vec{\varphi} \cdot \vec{T}$ with $\vec{\varphi}^2 = 1$. In that case indeed[9] bilinear terms in $A_\mu A_\nu$ cancel between the two terms of eq(1), and

$$F_{\mu\nu} = Tr \left\{ \partial_\mu (\hat{\Phi} A_\nu) - \partial_\nu (\hat{\Phi} A_\mu) \right\} - \frac{i}{g} Tr \left\{ \hat{\Phi} [\partial_\mu \hat{\Phi}, \partial_\nu \hat{\Phi}] \right\} \quad (2)$$

In the gauge in which $\hat{\Phi} = \hat{\Phi}_{diag}$, or $\vec{\varphi} = (0, 0, 1)$, $\partial_\mu \varphi = 0$ and

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu^3 - \partial_\nu A_\mu^3 \quad (3)$$

The generic operator Φ can be written $\Phi = c(x)\hat{\Phi}(x)$ with

$$\hat{\Phi}(x) = U^\dagger(x)\Phi_{diag}U(x) \quad (4)$$

$U(x)$ is the abelian projection, and the residual $U(1)$ has T^3 as a generator in the abelian projected gauge.

The operator which creates a monopole at $(\vec{x}, x^0)$ is [5, 10]

$$\mu(\vec{x}, x^0) = \exp \left(\int d^3y \vec{b}_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \cdot \text{Tr} \left\{ \vec{E}(\vec{y}, x^0) \hat{\Phi}(x) \right\} \right) \quad (5)$$

where $\vec{E}$ is the electric field operator, and $\vec{b}_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y})$ is the classical vector potential produced at $\vec{y}$ by a monopole sitting at $\vec{x}$, in the transverse gauge $\vec{\nabla} b_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) = 0$. The operator defined by eq.(5) is nothing but the translation of the field $\vec{A}_\perp^3(\vec{y}, x^0)$ by $\vec{b}_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y})$ in the abelian projected gauge. In the Schroedinger picture

$$\mu|\vec{A}_\perp^3(\vec{y}, x^0)\rangle = |\vec{A}_\perp^3(\vec{y}, x^0) + \vec{b}_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y})\rangle \quad (6)$$

since $\vec{E}_\perp^3$ is the conjugate momentum to $\vec{A}_\perp^3$. More generally any configuration of monopoles and antimonopoles can be added at $t = x^0$ by an appropriate choice of $\vec{b}_\perp$. By use of eq.(4) and of the cyclicity of the trace the operator μ can be written

$$\mu(\vec{x}, x^0) = \exp \left(\int d^3y \vec{b}_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \cdot \text{Tr} \left\{ U \vec{E}(\vec{y}, x^0) U^\dagger \hat{\Phi}_{diag} \right\} \right) \quad (7)$$

The unitary transformation $U(x)$ is what distinguishes one abelian projection from another.

The correlator of any number of monopole fields is given by

$$\langle T[\mu_1(x_1) \dots \mu_n(x_n)] \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int dM \mu_1(x_1) \dots \mu_n(x_n) \quad (8)$$

$Z = \int dM$. A change of variables $A_\mu \rightarrow UA_\mu U^\dagger + i\partial_\mu U U^\dagger$ leaves the measure dM invariant and replaces $UEU^\dagger$ by E in the expression for $\langle \mu \rangle$ eq(7). This proves that the correlator eq.(8) is projection independent: whatever the choice of U all the μ 's can be replaced by

$$\mu(\vec{x}, x^0) = \exp \left(\int d^3y \vec{b}_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \cdot \text{Tr} \left\{ \vec{E}(\vec{y}, x^0) \hat{\Phi}_{diag} \right\} \right) \quad (9)$$

which is projection independent. In particular $\langle \mu \rangle$ is projection independent, and such is the Higgs nature of the confined phase and the Coulomb nature of the deconfined one.

For generic $SU(N)$ the argument is analogous. The choices for Φ in eq.(1), which lead to eq.(2) can be identified [11]: there are $N - 1$ independent possibilities $\Phi^a = U^\dagger \Phi_{diag}^a U$ with arbitrary $U(x)$ and

$$\Phi_{diag}^a = \left(\overbrace{\frac{a}{N}, \frac{a}{N}, \dots, \frac{a}{N}}^b, \overbrace{-\frac{b}{N}, -\frac{b}{N}, \dots, -\frac{b}{N}}^a \right) \quad b = N - a \quad (10)$$

Any operator Φ in the adjoint representation is of the form $\Phi = U^\dagger \Phi_{diag} U$ with U a gauge transformation. Since the Φ_{diag}^a are a complete basis for diagonal matrices $\Phi = \sum c_a U^\dagger \Phi_{diag}^a U$. In the abelian projected gauge the field $F_{\mu\nu}^a$ corresponding to a given Φ^a will be

$$F_{\mu\nu}^a = \text{Tr} \left\{ \partial_\mu (\Phi_{diag}^a A_\nu) - \partial_\nu (\Phi_{diag}^a A_\mu) \right\} \quad (11)$$

Only the diagonal part of A^μ contributes. A_{diag}^μ can be expanded in terms of a complete set of diagonal matrices α^a , which obey the orthonormality relations $\text{Tr}(\Phi^a \alpha^b) = \delta^{ab}$,

$$\alpha_{diag}^a = (\overbrace{0 \dots 0}^{a-1}, 1, -1, 0, \dots, 0) \quad (12)$$

The $N - 1$ abelian fields produced by the abelian projection correspond to the generators eq.(12). The operator which creates a monopole of the a -th $U(1)$ is then

$$\mu^a(\vec{x}, x^0) = \exp \left(\int d^3 y \vec{b}_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \cdot \text{Tr} \left\{ U^\dagger \Phi_{diag}^a U \vec{E}(\vec{y}, x^0) \right\} \right) \quad (13)$$

or

$$\langle \mu^a \rangle = \langle \exp \left(\int d^3 y \vec{b}_\perp(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \cdot \text{Tr} \left\{ \Phi_{diag}^a U \vec{E}(\vec{y}, x^0) U^\dagger \right\} \right) \rangle \quad (14)$$

Again in the correlator of any number of μ 's the unitary transformation U can be reabsorbed by a gauge transformation which leaves the measure invariant, proving the independence on U , i.e. on the abelian projection.

All that can be trivially translated into the regularized version of the theory on the lattice[5, 6, 7]. In fact in ref.[7] a numerical comparison was done between $\langle \mu \rangle$ corresponding to a number of abelian projections, and the $\langle \mu \rangle$ of the form eq.(14), considered as an average on abelian projections, and they were equal within errors: we can now say that this only means that our numerical procedure was correct.

In conclusion the correlators of monopole fields are abelian projection independent, and such should be the field theory reconstructed from them. In particular dual superconductivity of the vacuum is an intrinsic, projection independent, property.

Thanks are due to M.D'Elia, L. Del Debbio and to G.Paffuti for helpful discussions. This work was partially supported by MIUR project Teoria e fenomenologia delle particelle elementari.

* Electronic address: adriano.digiaco@df.unipi.it

REFERENCES

- [1] G.'tHooft in High Energy Physics , EPS International Conference Palermo 1975 , A. Zichichi ed.
- [2] S. Mandelstam , Phys. Rep. **23 C**, 245 ,(1976).
- [3] G. 'tHooft , Nucl. Phys. **B 190**, 455, (1981).
- [4] R. W. Haymaker, Phys. Rep. **315**, 153, (1999).
- [5] A. Di Giacomo, B. Lucini, L. Montesi, G. Paffuti, Phys. Rev. **D 61**, 034503, (2000).
- [6] A. Di Giacomo, B. Lucini, L. Montesi, G. Paffuti, Phys. Rev. **D 61**, 034505, (2000).
- [7] J. M. Carmona, M. D'Elia, A. Di Giacomo, B. Lucini, G. Paffuti, Phys. Rev. **D 64**, 114507,(2001).
- [8] G. 'tHooft, Nucl. Phys **B 79**, 276, (1974).
- [9] J. Arafune, P.G.O. Freund, G.J. Goebel , Journ. Math. Phys. **16**, 433 (1974).
- [10] A. Di Giacomo, Acta Phys. Polon. **B 25**, 215, (1994).
- [11] L. Del Debbio, A. Di Giacomo, B. Lucini, G. Paffuti, hep-lat/0203023